UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,639	09/12/2003	Masayuki Yoshida	01272.020631.	7109

5514 7590 06/26/2008

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER	
DICKERSON, CHAD S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/660,639	YOSHIDA, MASAYUKI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chad Dickerson	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 May 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *20,21,24,25,28 and 29* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *20, 21, 24, 25, 28 and 29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *12 September 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/22/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The Amendment to the claims has necessitated a new ground(s) of rejection. However, the Examiner still believes that the references of Cedar and Hino disclose the feature of making an adjustment to expand the output area in the system of Cedar. However, the references do not specifically state expanding an output area into a plurality of pages. The Examiner used the reference of Yudasaka '211 to cure the deficiency of these references.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 20, 24 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cedar '650 (6256650) in view of Hino '788 (US Pub No 2002/0036788) and Yudasaka '211 (US Pub No 2003/0202211).

Re claim 20: Cedar '650 discloses a document printing system (see col. 10, lines 7-9) comprising:

a first calculation unit for calculating a font size based on a scaling factor of an output area (i.e. in the system, the fullness ratio, considered analogous to the scaling factor since it is the ratio of height or width of the editable text and the text frame, is used to determine the theoretical font size in the system. With the font size being scaled based on the fullness ratio, the calculation of the theoretical font size is based on the fullness ratio. The fullness ratio can account for a text frame output area or the whole amount of the display screen, considered as the output area. The functions of the first calculation unit and other units in the system are performed by the many program modules stored in the drives (110, 113, 114 and 109) that are executed by the CPU (102); see col. 10, lines 36-67, col. 11, line 1 – col. 12, line 47);

a decision unit for deciding whether the font size calculated by said first calculation unit is smaller than a minimum font size or not (i.e. when the system calculates the theoretical font size, the system determines whether this font size is between the maximum and minimum allowed theoretical font sizes. This can apply to a scenario where the theoretical font size can be greater than the max or smaller than the

minimum theoretical font size. When the theoretical font size lies outside the range from the max or min, the system adjusts the theoretical font size according to the method in column 20; see col. 16, line 60 – col. 17, line 22 and col. 19, line 13 – col. 20, line 14);

a second calculation unit for calculating an expansion for expanding the font size to the font size (i.e. when the system determines that the theoretical font size is not between the minimum and maximum value allowed, the system either expands the font size if it is lower than the minimum or reduces the size if it is larger than the max, to a size that is halfway between the min and max theoretical values; see figs. 2-5; col. 16, line 60 – col. 17, line 22 and col. 19, line 13 – col. 20, line 14) when said decision unit determines that the font size calculated by said first calculation unit is smaller than the minimum font size (i.e. in the system, the theoretical font size can be determined to be smaller than the minimum theoretical font size and the font size be magnified to a different size. This is shown in figure 4; see figs. 2-5; col. 16, line 60 – col. 17, line 22 and col. 19, line 13 – col. 20, line 14); and

an adjusting unit for making adjustment to expand the output area based on the expansion calculated by said second calculation unit (i.e. in the system, the area where the characters are output can be resized by the resize height determined by the system. The resize height is used to resize the text frame where the image data is output, considered as the output area; see col. 11, lines 1-12).

However, Cedar '650 fails to teach a second calculation unit for calculating an expansion ratio for expanding the font size to the minimum font size and expansion ratio.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Hino '788. Hino '788 discloses a second calculation unit for calculating an expansion ratio for expanding the font size to the minimum font size (i.e. shown in figure 24, the size of the characters are determined, which is considered analogous to font size. The minimum of the character sizes are also detected in the system. With the system first detecting that the character is a minimum size of 6 points and secondly detecting that the desired minimum size is 8 point characters that are needed in the document, the system calculates a magnification ratio to apply to the characters to expand the characters to the minimum size of 8 points. The magnification rate is considered to be 8/6; see fig. 24; paragraphs [0172]-[0183]) and expansion ratio (i.e. the magnification ratio is considered as the expansion ratio; paragraphs [0172]-[0183]).

Therefore, in view of Hino '788, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the functions of a second calculation unit for calculating an expansion ratio for expanding the font size to the minimum font size and an expansion ratio in order to have a magnification ratio to enlarge the character to the detected minimum character size (as stated in Hino '788 paragraph [0176]).

However, Cedar '650 in view of Hino '788 fails to teach making adjustment to expand the output area into a plurality of pages based on the expansion ratio calculated.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Yudasaka '211. Yudasaka '211 discloses making adjustment to expand the output area into a plurality of pages based on the expansion ratio calculated (i.e. shown in figures 13a-c are examples of an output area being expanded into a plurality of pages based on a magnification K, which is registered as a ratio of enlargement in the process of converting master image data into the size of the printing image as the output. Depending on the components SAx, SAy with the other components SBx, SBy, determines how many pages the master image data is extends onto printing image pages. With a favorable ratio of the above components that makeup the magnification K, the master image data can expand over a large amount of the output area, which can be comprised of a plurality of pages (i.e. shown in fig. 13A), or the image data can be over a large area on one page (i.e. shown in fig. 11); see figs. 8-13; paragraphs [0066]-[0074]).

Therefore, in view of Yudasaka '211, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of making adjustment to expand the output area into a plurality of pages based on the expansion ratio calculated incorporated in the device of Cedar '650, as modified by features of Hino '788, in order to have image data magnified by a predetermined magnification and

to have printing page image data of a greater size than the size of the printing paper actually used for printing (as stated in Yudasaka '211 paragraph [0007]).

Re claim 24: Cedar '650 discloses a document printing method (see col. 10, lines 7-9) comprising:

a first calculation step for calculating a font size based on a scaling factor of an output area (i.e. in the system, the fullness ratio, considered analogous to the scaling factor since it is the ratio of height or width of the editable text and the text frame, is used to determine the theoretical font size in the system. With the font size being scaled based on the fullness ratio, the calculation of the theoretical font size is based on the fullness ratio. The fullness ratio can account for a text frame output area or the whole amount of the display screen, considered as the output area. The functions of the first calculation unit and other units in the system are performed by the many program modules stored in the drives (110, 113, 114 and 109) that are executed by the CPU (102); see col. 10, lines 36-67, col. 11, line 1 – col. 12, line 47);

a decision step for deciding whether the font size calculated by said first calculation step is smaller than a minimum font size or not (i.e. when the system calculates the theoretical font size, the system determines whether this font size is between the maximum and minimum allowed theoretical font sizes. This can apply to a scenario where the theoretical font size can be greater than the max or smaller than the minimum theoretical font size. When the theoretical font size lies outside the range

from the max or min, the system adjusts the theoretical font size according to the method in column 20; see col. 16, line 60 – col. 17, line 22 and col. 19, line 13 – col. 20, line 14);

a second calculation step for calculating an expansion for expanding the font size to the font size (i.e. when the system determines that the theoretical font size is not between the minimum and maximum value allowed, the system either expands the font size if it is lower than the minimum or reduces the size if it is larger than the max, to a size that is halfway between the min and max theoretical values; see figs. 2-5; col. 16, line 60 – col. 17, line 22 and col. 19, line 13 – col. 20, line 14) when said decision step determines that the font size calculated by said first calculation step is smaller than the minimum font size (i.e. in the system, the theoretical font size can be determined to be smaller than the minimum theoretical font size and the font size be magnified to a different size. This is shown in figure 4; see figs. 2-5; col. 16, line 60 – col. 17, line 22 and col. 19, line 13 – col. 20, line 14); and

an adjusting step for making adjustment to expand the output area based on the expansion calculated by said second calculation step (i.e. in the system, the area where the characters are output can be resized by the resize height determined by the system. The resize height is used to resize the text frame where the image data is output, considered as the output area; see col. 11, lines 1-12).

However, Cedar '650 fails to teach a second calculation step for calculating an expansion ratio for expanding the font size to the minimum font size and expansion ratio.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Hino '788. Hino '788 discloses a second calculation step for calculating an expansion ratio for expanding the font size to the minimum font size (i.e. shown in figure 24, the size of the characters are determined, which is considered analogous to font size. The minimum of the character sizes are also detected in the system. With the system first detecting that the character is a minimum size of 6 points and secondly detecting that the desired minimum size is 8 point characters that are needed in the document, the system calculates a magnification ratio to apply to the characters to expand the characters to the minimum size of 8 points. The magnification rate is considered to be 8/6; see fig. 24; paragraphs [0172]-[0183]) and expansion ratio (i.e. the magnification ratio is considered as the expansion ratio; paragraphs [0172]-[0183]).

Therefore, in view of Hino '788, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the method step of a second calculation step for calculating an expansion ratio for expanding the font size to the minimum font size and an expansion ratio in order to have a magnification ratio to enlarge the character to the detected minimum character size (as stated in Hino '788 paragraph [0176]).

However, Cedar '650 in view of Hino '788 fails to teach making adjustment to expand the output area into a plurality of pages based on the expansion ratio calculated.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Yudasaka '211. Yudasaka '211 discloses making adjustment to expand the output area into a plurality of pages based on the expansion ratio calculated (i.e. shown in figures 13a-c are examples of an output area being expanded into a plurality of pages based on a magnification K, which is registered as a ratio of enlargement in the process of converting master image data into the size of the printing image as the output. Depending on the components SAx, SAy with the other components SBx, SBy, determines how many pages the master image data is extends onto printing image pages. With a favorable ratio of the above components that makeup the magnification K, the master image data can expand over a large amount of the output area, which can be comprised of a plurality of pages (i.e. shown in fig. 13A), or the image data can be over a large area on one page (i.e. shown in fig. 11); see figs. 8-13; paragraphs [0066]-[0074]).

Therefore, in view of Yudasaka '211, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the method step of making adjustment to expand the output area into a plurality of pages based on the expansion ratio calculated incorporated in the device of Cedar '650, as modified by features of Hino '788, in order to have image data magnified by a predetermined magnification and

to have printing page image data of a greater size than the size of the printing paper actually used for printing (as stated in Yudasaka '211 paragraph [0007]).

Re claim 28: Cedar '650 discloses a computer-readable medium storing thereon a computer program for instructing a computer to execute a method for document printing (see col. 10, lines 7-9) comprising:

a first calculation step for calculating a font size based on a scaling factor of an output area (i.e. in the system, the fullness ratio, considered analogous to the scaling factor since it is the ratio of height or width of the editable text and the text frame, is used to determine the theoretical font size in the system. With the font size being scaled based on the fullness ratio, the calculation of the theoretical font size is based on the fullness ratio. The fullness ratio can account for a text frame output area or the whole amount of the display screen, considered as the output area. The functions of the first calculation unit and other units in the system are performed by the many program modules stored in the drives (110, 113, 114 and 109) that are executed by the CPU (102); see col. 10, lines 36-67, col. 11, line 1 – col. 12, line 47);

a decision step for deciding whether the font size calculated by said first calculation step is smaller than a minimum font size or not (i.e. when the system calculates the theoretical font size, the system determines whether this font size is between the maximum and minimum allowed theoretical font sizes. This can apply to a scenario where the theoretical font size can be greater than the max or smaller than the

minimum theoretical font size. When the theoretical font size lies outside the range from the max or min, the system adjusts the theoretical font size according to the method in column 20; see col. 16, line 60 – col. 17, line 22 and col. 19, line 13 – col. 20, line 14);

a second calculation step for calculating an expansion for expanding the font size to the font size (i.e. when the system determines that the theoretical font size is not between the minimum and maximum value allowed, the system either expands the font size if it is lower than the minimum or reduces the size if it is larger than the max, to a size that is halfway between the min and max theoretical values; see figs. 2-5; col. 16, line 60 – col. 17, line 22 and col. 19, line 13 – col. 20, line 14) when said decision step determines that the font size calculated by said first calculation step is smaller than the minimum font size (i.e. in the system, the theoretical font size can be determined to be smaller than the minimum theoretical font size and the font size be magnified to a different size. This is shown in figure 4; see figs. 2-5; col. 16, line 60 – col. 17, line 22 and col. 19, line 13 – col. 20, line 14); and

an adjusting step for making adjustment to expand the output area based on the expansion calculated by said second calculation step (i.e. in the system, the area where the characters are output can be resized by the resize height determined by the system. The resize height is used to resize the text frame where the image data is output, considered as the output area; see col. 11, lines 1-12).

However, Cedar '650 fails to teach a second calculation step for calculating an expansion ratio for expanding the font size to the minimum font size and expansion ratio.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Hino '788. Hino '788 discloses a second calculation step for calculating an expansion ratio for expanding the font size to the minimum font size (i.e. shown in figure 24, the size of the characters are determined, which is considered analogous to font size. The minimum of the character sizes are also detected in the system. With the system first detecting that the character is a minimum size of 6 points and secondly detecting that the desired minimum size is 8 point characters that are needed in the document, the system calculates a magnification ratio to apply to the characters to expand the characters to the minimum size of 8 points. The magnification rate is considered to be 8/6; see fig. 24; paragraphs [0172]-[0183]) and expansion ratio (i.e. the magnification ratio is considered as the expansion ratio; paragraphs [0172]-[0183]).

Therefore, in view of Hino '788, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the method step of a second calculation step for calculating an expansion ratio for expanding the font size to the minimum font size and an expansion ratio in order to have a magnification ratio to enlarge the character to the detected minimum character size (as stated in Hino '788 paragraph [0176]).

However, Cedar '650 in view of Hino '788 fails to teach making adjustment to expand the output area into a plurality of pages based on the expansion ratio calculated.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Yudasaka '211. Yudasaka '211 discloses making adjustment to expand the output area into a plurality of pages based on the expansion ratio calculated (i.e. shown in figures 13a-c are examples of an output area being expanded into a plurality of pages based on a magnification K, which is registered as a ratio of enlargement in the process of converting master image data into the size of the printing image as the output. Depending on the components SAx, SAy with the other components SBx, SBy, determines how many pages the master image data is extends onto printing image pages. With a favorable ratio of the above components that makeup the magnification K, the master image data can expand over a large amount of the output area, which can be comprised of a plurality of pages (i.e. shown in fig. 13A), or the image data can be over a large area on one page (i.e. shown in fig. 11); see figs. 8-13; paragraphs [0066]-[0074]).

Therefore, in view of Yudasaka '211, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the program step of making adjustment to expand the output area into a plurality of pages based on the expansion ratio calculated incorporated in the device of Cedar '650, as modified by features of Hino '788, in order to have image data magnified by a predetermined magnification and

to have printing page image data of a greater size than the size of the printing paper actually used for printing (as stated in Yudasaka ‘211 paragraph [0007]).

5. Claims 21, 22, 25, 26, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cedar '650, as modified by Hino '788 and Yudasaka ‘211, as applied to claims 20, 24 and 28 above, and further in view of Hertzfeld '824 (US Pat No 6441824).

Re claim 21: The teachings of Cedar '650 in view of Hino '788 and Yudasaka ‘211 are disclosed above.

However, Cedar '650 in view of Hino '788 and Yudasaka ‘211 fails to teach the document printing system as claimed in claim 20, further comprising a changing unit for changing a font type according to the font size.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Hertzfeld ‘824. Hertzfeld ‘824 discloses further comprising a changing unit for changing a font type according to the font size (i.e. in the system, the changing of the font type can occur in addition to changing the font size. Both the font type and size can be varied depending on which combination of the two attributes fits the display area available; see col. 1, line 45 – col. 2, line 2 and col. 4, lines 3-50).

Therefore, in view of Hertzfeld ‘824, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have a changing unit for changing a font type according to the font size in order to find a combination of the font size and

type that allows information to fit within the display area available (as stated in Hertzfeld '824).

Re claim 25: The teachings of Cedar '650 in view of Hino '788 and Yudasaka '211 are disclosed above.

However, Cedar '650 in view of Hino '788 and Yudasaka '211 fails to teach the document printing method as claimed in claim 24, further comprising a changing step for changing a font type according to the font size.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Hertzfeld '824. Hertzfeld '824 discloses further comprising a changing step for changing a font type according to the font size (i.e. in the system, the changing of the font type can occur in addition to changing the font size. Both the font type and size can be varied depending on which combination of the two attributes fits the display area available; see col. 1, line 45 – col. 2, line 2 and col. 4, lines 3-50).

Therefore, in view of Hertzfeld '824, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have method step of a changing step for changing a font type according to the font size in order to find a combination of the font size and type that allows information to fit within the display area available (as stated in Hertzfeld '824).

Re claim 29: The teachings of Cedar '650 in view of Hino '788 and Yudasaka ‘211 are disclosed above.

However, Cedar '650 in view of Hino '788 and Yudasaka ‘211 fails to teach the computer-readable medium as claimed in claim 28, wherein the method further comprises a changing step for changing a font type according to the font size.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Hertzfeld '824. Hertzfeld '824 discloses wherein the method further comprises a changing step for changing a font type according to the font size (i.e. in the system, the changing of the font type can occur in addition to changing the font size. Both the font type and size can be varied depending on which combination of the two attributes fits the display area available; see col. 1, line 45 – col. 2, line 2 and col. 4, lines 3-50).

Therefore, in view of Hertzfeld '824, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the method step of wherein the method further comprises a changing step for changing a font type according to the font size in order to find a combination of the font size and type that allows information to fit within the display area available (as stated in Hertzfeld ‘824).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

7. Miura '831 (US Pat No 6081831) discloses a system where text data detected is compared to a font size to see if it is above or below a minimum font size. The system then calculates a magnification ratio to magnify the font if it is smaller than the minimum font size.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHAD DICKERSON whose telephone number is (571)270-1351. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Thur. 9:00-6:30 Fri. 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler Haskins can be reached on (571)-272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. D./
/Chad Dickerson/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Twyler L. Haskins/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625